REMARKS

Claims 1-9, 11-24, and 26-41 are pending and under consideration. In the non-final Office Action of March 16, 2007, the Examiner rejected claims 1-9, 11-24, and 26-41 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Simonson, et al., "Version augmented URIs for reference permanence via an Apache module design" ("Simonson").* Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and address the Examiner's disposition below.

Applicants' independent claims 1, 15, 16, 30, 31, 37, 38, 39, and 40 each claim a network address that is contained within a document or web page. The network address includes both a timer value/time stamp and a calculated value, which is based on the timer value/time stamp. In an illustrative example, the network address may be a URL that includes both a timer value, such as a date and time, and a calculated value that is based on the date and time.

As described in Applicants' specification, the claimed enhanced network address, which includes a timer value/time stamp as well as a calculated value that is based on the timer value/time stamp, provides enhanced information that can be used by a user. Specification, page 5, lines 26-29. This also provides a greater amount of control in the network. In an illustrative example, as described in the specification, if a client sends a second request for a web page using an amended network address that was in the web page, a server can determine whether the web page has been changed since the time stamp/timer value was amended to the network address. If the web page has been modified, then the server can output the modified web page. Specification, page 5, lines 30-34.

This is clearly unlike *Simonson*, which fails to disclose or suggest incorporating both a timer value/time stamp and a calculated value, which is based on the timer value/time stamp, in a network address that is within a document or web page. The Examiner agrees that *Simonson* fails to disclose a document that includes a network address having both a timer value/time stamp as well as a calculated value that is based on the timer value/time stamp. *Office Action of 3/16/2007*, page 3. The Examiner argues that it would have been obvious to include both values. Applicants disagree.

Simonson merely augments a URI with either only a date or only a version. There is simply no suggestion or motivation in *Simonson* to include both a timer value/time stamp <u>and</u> a calculated value that is based on the timer value/time stamp in a network address. For example, *Simonson* does not mention the issues discussed in Applicants' specification of providing both a

timer value/time stamp and calculated value in order to provide enhanced information to the user and to provide a greater amount of control in a network. Thus, Applicants submit the Examiner has used impermissible hindsight to allege that it would have been obvious, based on the teachings of *Simonson*, to augment a network address with both a timer value/time stamp as well as a calculated value that is based on the timer value/time stamp.

Further, *Simonson* clearly teaches that its URI includes <u>either</u> a timer value <u>or</u> a version. In fact, *Simonson* teaches that the system must be configured understand <u>either</u> revision history <u>or</u> currency in a URI, as each of these uses a different syntax:

> As a heuristic guideline, the syntax used should reflect whether the revision history is of more interest (suggesting the version syntax) or whether the currency is of more interest (suggesting the time syntax).

Simonson, page 341-342.

For at least these reasons, *Simonson* fails to disclose or suggest claims 1, 15, 16, 30, 31, 37, 38, 39, and 40.

Claims 2-9, 11-14, 17-24, 26-29, 32-36, and 41 depend directly or indirectly from claims 1, 16, or 40 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons that claims 1, 16, and 40 are allowable.

Applicants respectfully submit the rejection has been overcome and request that it be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that claims 1-9, 11-24, and 26-41 are patentable. It is therefore submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/Christopher P. Rauch/   (Reg. No. 45,034)
Christopher P. Rauch
SONNENSCHEIN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
P. O. Box 061080
Wacker Drive Station - Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080
Telephone (312) 876 8000
Customer No. 26263